

## REMARKS

Original claims 1-7 remain in the case.

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Welland (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,487) in view of Levien (U.S. Patent No. 5,337,264), and in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA"); rejected claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable further in view of Glew *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,796,637); and objected to claims 4-7 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

The rejection of claim 1 states that "A filter circuit having as inputs a signal to be filtered (a forward signal) and a reverse version of the signal to be filtered (a reverse signal) (figure 2 discloses A, forward, and B, reverse (or inverse), signals being inputs to the circuit.)."

Upon closer review of column 14 of Welland, it becomes clear that it does not describe a filter circuit. "A circuit for accomplishing addition of the x3 digits of two numbers being added is shown in Fig. 2." (see Column 14, lines 50-52). Furthermore, B reverse is not a reverse version of the signal to be filtered A, but rather the reverse of the addend B. And B is not a signal to be filtered, as B and B inverse are switching signals. (See Column 14, lines 39-40.).

As Welland fails to provide a filter circuit having as inputs a signal to be filtered and a reverse version of the signal to be filtered, and the remainder or the rejection does not provide for this element, the combination provided in the rejection cannot render Claim 1 obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and Claim 1 be allowed.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1, and are allowable for the reasons discussed above as they depend from allowable claim 1. Furthermore, the rejection of these claims, which relies on Glew *et al.* fails to provide for the element that was missing in Welland, as discussed above. Accordingly, claims 2, and 3 are not obvious, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of these dependent claims.

Applicant acknowledges that the Examiner deems claims 4-7 to contain allowable subject matter. However claims 4-7 are allowable in their present form as depending from claims that are allowable for the reasons discussed above.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks allowance of claims 1-7 is urged, and such action and the issuance of this case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kevin M. Ferguson

By /Matthew D. Rabdau/  
Matthew D. Rabdau  
Reg. No. 43026  
Attorney for Applicant

TEKTRONIX, INC.  
P.O. Box 500 (50-LAW)  
Beaverton, OR 97077  
(503) 627-75068

Attorney Docket No. 7775-US